

new grounds for rejection have been made by the Examiner. Claims 1, 13, 20, 26, and 27 are independent claims.

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 20-22, 26, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Wolf et al. With regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Wolf et al. discloses "a plurality of word processing components for creating, editing and encoding an internet-compatible email document." The Examiner further states that Wolf et al. discloses "editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document."

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's analysis fails to address every limitation of claim 1. In particular, claim 1 specifically requires that the mail client have "a plurality of authoring and reading components, a first of said plurality of authoring components for creating a representation of a document including an other than text portion and for creating the other than text portion of the document". It is surprising that the Examiner did not address this part of claim 1 since it has been discussed many times during the prolonged prosecution of this application. In prior rejections, the Examiner confused the attachment or pasting of a graphic element in an otherwise text document with the actual creation of the graphic. It has been the Applicant's continuous opinion that the present invention is the only email client which has an authoring component capable of creating a non-text portion of a document. In the Examiner's

latest rejection of claim 1, this claim limitation is simply ignored. It is only in rejecting claim 3 does the Examiner suggest that Wolf et al. discloses editing an email document "using a full featured word-processor, spreadsheet, desktop publishing applications, etc."

With regard to the latter point, it is respectfully submitted that the mention of spreadsheet and desktop publishing in Wolf et al. is not a teaching of an authoring component of an email document. The following three quotes consist of the total disclosure of spreadsheets and desktop publishing in the Wolf et al. patent:

"An example of a foreign frame is a word processing document frame in which an embedded spreadsheet object is being displayed. FIG. 3 illustrates a word processing document frame 300. The frame 300 includes text 305 and an embedded graphics object 310." Col. 9, lines 50-54.

This teaching has nothing to do with authoring. It merely says that a non-text object may be pasted into an otherwise text email document. The Applicant has tried to explain this difference and point to phrases in claim 1 which clearly indicate what is meant by an authoring component, but it appears that the Examiner has not focused on this important difference.

"This member function is used by the word processor 1010 to convert between an MSOOBJECT that is a mail attachment and an MSOOBJECT that is a Packager OLE object that contains the attached file. This is used

when the user moves an MSOBJECT from a container mail note 1005 to a non-mail document (such as a spreadsheet or a regular word processor document) or the reverse. MSOOBJECT's that are mail attachments can only exist in a container mail note." Col. 18, lines 26-34.

Again, there is no teaching here of creating a non-text object. The only teaching is the display of non-text objects attached to or placed in a mail document.

"For example, the DocObject interfaces may be used to allow a spreadsheet program or desktop publishing program to display their respective documents in the view port provided by the container mail note." Col. 23, lines 63-66.

This should be read as a specific teaching away from the present invention. It calls for different programs which are not part of the email program to be used to display attachments to an email. There is no teaching of an email authoring component. In fact, the entire thrust of the Wolf et al. patent teaches away from the present invention.

The Wolf et al. patent is mainly concerned with the linking of a word processor with an email client to generate and display rich text documents. The word processor is not a component of the email client, it is a separate program. More importantly, however, the word processor does not create anything other than text. One could even say that the absence of authoring anything but text is "conspicuous" in the Wolf et al. patent.

In view of the foregoing, it is unnecessary to discuss claims 2-4 and 8-11 which depend from claim 1.

Independent claim 20 is a method claim which includes the following limitation: "providing a document-authoring component which authors a portion of a document which is other than a plain-text." Thus, the remarks made above apply to claim 20 as well as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is unnecessary to address the rejection of claims 21 and 22 which depend from claim 20.

Independent claim 26 is directed to an email client having "a plurality of authoring and reading components, each authoring component for creating a different kind of email message. While the Wolf et al. patent seems to disclose different reading programs associated with an email program, these are not components of the email program. More importantly, there is only one authoring program, i.e. the word processor. The spreadsheet and desktop publishing programs are mentioned only as used to display attachments to an email document.

Independent claim 27 includes the limitation "a plurality of authoring and reading components for authoring and reading different kinds of documents including documents which have content that is not plain text". As stated above, Wolf et al.

discloses only one authoring component.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wolf et al.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1 which is neither anticipated nor obvious over Wolf et al.

Claims 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Wolf et al. in view of Bradshaw.

Independent claim 13 includes the limitation "a plurality of authoring components, a first of said plurality of authoring components for creating a representation of a text document and a second of said plurality of authoring components for creating a representation of a document including other than text". As stated above, Wolf et al. does not disclose more than one authoring component. The Examiner cites Bradshaw for teaching the last limitation of claim 13, i.e. that "at least one of said authoring components includes means for determining whether the user is the student or the teacher." Bradshaw relates to a security system which limits access to the contents of a computer or the contents of the worldwide web. Bradshaw mentions that a teacher could use the system to limit student access. However, this is far from disclosing or suggesting an email authoring component which distinguishes between a teacher and a student.

The argument made above applies also to dependent claims 14-16.

All of the remaining rejections deal with the dependent claims and are moot in view of the remarks made above.

In light of all of the above, and the previously submitted Remarks and Declarations, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David P. Gordon".

David P. Gordon
Reg. #29,996
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Gordon and Jacobson, P.C.
65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-1160

March 10, 2003